

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01726 252153Z
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 IO-13 ISO-00 NSC-05 FEA-01 CIAE-00
INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 EB-08 NRC-05 OES-06 ERDA-05
H-01 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15
USIA-06 TRSE-00 /107 W
-----260931Z 112578 /15

R 251907Z MAR 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2450
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 6975
USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1726

EO11652 GDS
TAGS NATO PARM
SUBJECT NATO CONSULTATIONS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS (CW)

REF A) STATE 061090 DTG 182333Z MAR 77 (NOTAL;
B) USNATO 1284 DTG 081859Z MAR 77 (NOTAL)

SUMMARY: AT FRG INITIATIVE, POLADS MET MARCH 25, WITH EXPERTS
FROM FRG (HAUBER), UK (HOLMES) AND NETHERLANDS (BRUYNS)
IN ATTENDANCE, TO DISCUSS FRG PAPER ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS
MATTERS (REF B) CIRCULATED AT NATO MARCH 7.
DISCUSSION WAS RUDIMENTARY AND DEALT PRIMARILY WITH FIVE
PRINCIPLES OF ALLIED APPROACH TO CW NEGOTIATIONS SUGGESTED IN
FRG PAPER. END SUMMARY.

1. HAUBER OPENED BY MAKING STRONG PITCH FOR CONSULTATIONS ON
DISARMAMENT MATTERS AT NATO, WHICH HE ARGUED WERE SATISFACTORY ON
ISSUES LIKE MBFR, BUT PERHAPS INSUFFICIENT ON SOME ARMS CONTROL
ISSUES CONSIDERED AT THE CCD AND UN. HAUBER BELIEVED THERE WAS
GROWING AWARENESS OF NEED FOR INCREASED NATO CONSULTATIONS ON CW
WHICH WAS LIKELY TO BE A SUBJECT OF NEGOTIATIONS IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01726 252153Z

2. A NUMBER OF OTHER REPS SUPPORTED FRG VIEW AND NOTED THEIR
INTEREST IN THE DANISH PAPER ON NATO ARMS CONTROL CONSULTATIONS.
TURKISH REP SAID ARMS CONTROL CONSULTATIONS AT NATO WERE PARTICU-
LARLY IMPORTANT FOR ALLIES THAT WERE NOT CCD MEMBERS.

3. HAUBER SAID THE FRG WOULD LIKE TO SEE A CW CONVENTION IN THE
NEAR FUTURE, PARTICULARLY IN LIGHT OF THE FRG' RENUNCIATION FO CW,
BUT BELIEVED THAT A CW PROHIBITION WOULD AFFECT NATO STRATEGY AND
ALLIED SECURITY. ACCORDINGLY, THE FRG THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USEFUL
FOR THE ALLIES TO REACH AGREEMENT ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES REGARDING A

CW PROHIBITION BEFORE NEGOTIATIONS BEGAN OR AGREEMENTS WERE REACHED WITH OTHER COUNTRIES ON THIS MATTER. THE PRINCIPLES SUGGESTED BY THE FRG TOOK INTO CONSIDERATION EXISTING NATO DOCTRINE ON CW, AS EXPRESSED IN PARA 30 OF MC 14/3, AS WELL AS THE ASSUMPTION THAT ALL ALLIES WOULD WISH A CW AGREEMENT TO BE EFFECTIVELY VERIFIED.

4. HAUBER THEN REVIEWED IN DETAIL POINTS SUGGESTED BY THE FRG. HE DESCRIBED SOVIET CW CAPABILITIES IN GENERAL TERMS, STATING THAT THEY REPRESENTED A SERIOUS THREAT TO NATO AND SUGGESTING THAT THE ALLIES MIGHT BE DISADVANTAGED BY A PROHIBITION THAT ONLY COVERED THE MOST HIGHLY TOXIC AGENTS, WHICH WERE IMPORTANT IN US CAPABILITIES, SINCE THERE WERE INDICATIONS THAT SOVIET STOCKS INCLUDE OLDER TOXIC AGENTS SUCH AS HYDROGEN CYANIDE. HAUBER EXPLAINED POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO VERIFICATION OF A CW BAN, EMPHASIZING THE PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS OF VERIFICATION, AND ALSO STRESSED THAT ANY CW AGREEMENT SHOULD BE NON-DISCRIMINATORY AND SHOULD AIM FOR DESTRUCTION OF STOCKPILES.

5. UK EXPERT HOLMES DESCRIBED IN DETAIL HOW THE BRITISH DRAFT CONVENTION COVERED THE POINTS RAISED BY THE FRG. NETHERLANDS EXPERT QUESTIONED THE WORDING OF THE FRG POINTS, WHICH HE FOUND TOO CATEGORICAL IN SOME INSTANCES AND BELIEVED SHOULD BE PHRASED IN MORE FLEXIBLE AND GENERAL TERMS IF THEY WERE TO BE ACCEPTABLE TO ALL ALLIES.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01726 252153Z

6. FRENCH REP SAID HER AUTHORITIES HAD APPROVED THE GERMAN SUGGESTION FOR POLADS CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS ON CW, ACCEPTED THE FIRST THREE OF THE GERMAN POINTS, BUT WERE STILL CONSIDERING POINTS 4 AND 5. ITALIAN, BELGIAN, DANISH, PORTUGUESE AND GREEK REPS SAID THEIR AUTHORITIES AGREED WITH THE GERMAN POINTS. US, CANADIAN, TURKISH, AND NORWEGIAN REPS SAID THEY TOOK GERMAN POINTS SIMPLY AS A BASIS FOR DISCUSSION AND UNDERSTOOD THAT POLADS WERE NOT ATTEMPTING TO ELABORATE PRINCIPLES FOR FORMAL ALLIED APPROVAL. OTHERS ACCEPTED THIS APPROACH.

7. US REP REVIEWED US PAPER (REF A), WHICH WE HAD CIRCULATED TO POLADS. SEVERAL REPS EXPRESSED INTEREST IN US-SOVIET TECHNICAL DISCUSSIONS AND APPRECIATION FOR INDICATION THAT US REP AT DISARMAMENT EXPERTS MEETING WOULD PROVIDE A REPORT ON THOSE DISCUSSIONS. STRAUSZ-HUPE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 25-Mar-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977NATO001726
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: n/a
Format: TEL
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t197703110/baaabcoh.tel
Line Count: 102
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Message ID: f09e01b0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2963562
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CHANGED> MCM 20040809
Subject: SUBJECT NATO CONSULTATIONS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS (CW)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE SECDEF MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/f09e01b0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009